<u>REMARKS</u>

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 3, 2006. Claims 19 to 24 remain in the application, of which Claims 19, 23 and 24 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 19 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph for allegedly omitting essential elements. The rejections are respectfully traversed. In this regard, the claimed elements are to 1) determine an order for adapting documents, and then 2) to adapt the documents in the determined order. Thus, it is clear that the adapting step, when adapting the documents *in the determined order*, necessarily orders the documents as part of the adaptation process. Thus, Applicant fail to see the need to include an "ordering means". Nonetheless, the claims have been amended to include the feature of a selecting means/step, as described in page 13, lines 10 to 25 (see also, step E52 of Fig. 5A). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

Claims 19 to 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,959,318 (Tso) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,556,217 (Makipaa). These rejections are also respectfully traversed and the Examiner is requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in light of the following comments.

The invention relates to ordering documents (e.g., web pages) before receiving an access request for a document. According to the invention, a server receives, from a user terminal, characteristics related to the user terminal. For example, when a user first issues an access request for a web page, characteristics of the user terminal are received. Then, based on the received characteristics, an order is determined to adapting documents for outputting the documents based on a frequency of access to the documents.

- 6 -

That is, further documents that may be related to the first accessed document are ordered based on which documents are accessed most frequently. Then, in the determined order, documents are selected and adapted for output in the server before a request for the document is received. As a result, further documents to be accessed are properly adapted for output to the user terminal prior to the user terminal issuing an access request so that a more efficient document providing operation can be obtained.

Referring specifically to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is a server for providing a document via a network, comprising receiving means for receiving, from a user terminal, characteristics related to the user terminal, determining means for determining an order for adapting documents for outputting the documents according to a frequency of access to the documents, selecting means for selecting documents according to the determined order, adapting means for adapting for output, in accordance with the received characteristics related to the user terminal, the selected documents in the determined order before receiving a request for access to a document, receiving means for receiving a request for access to a document, reading means for reading out an adapted document upon reception of the request for access to the document, and sending means for sending the document read out by the reading means to the user terminal.

Claims 23 and 24 are method and computer program claims, respectively, that substantially correspond to Claim 19.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of Claims 19, 23 and 24, and in particular, is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of a server adapting for output, in accordance with characteristics related to a user terminal that are received from the user terminal,

documents in an order that is determined according to a frequency of access to the documents, before receiving a request for access to a document.

Tso discloses that a communication session between a client and a server is disconnected if the priority of the communication is considered to be low based on the characteristics of the communication. Tso also discloses that a URL list is created, based on a frequency of access to the URL's, from a requested Web page in order to preliminarily call up a URL for a proxy server. Thus, Tso merely determines an order for accessing URLs, which may be seen to correspond to determining an order for accessing the documents, but Tso fails to adapt the documents in accordance with characteristics of a user terminal that are received from the user terminal, or that the documents are adapted before receiving a request for access to a document.

Makipaa discloses that characteristics of a user terminal are obtained from a database based on the model of the user terminal. However, Makipaa fails to disclose that the characteristics of the user terminal are received from the user terminal. Makipaa also fails to adapt the documents in accordance with characteristics of a user terminal that are received from the user terminal, or that the documents are adapted before receiving a request for access to a document. Rather, Makipaa has a pagination and terminal adaptation module which calculates the space needed by an element to be displayed on a user terminal. As described with reference to figures 1 and 3, Makipaa identifies a user terminal type and screen size upon logon of the user, and then extracts corresponding layout and typographical settings from a database in order to perform content adaptation. As explained with respect to figure 3, the content adaptation is always performed after the content request by the client is received. This shortcoming of Makipaa is one disadvantage of the prior art that the present invention resolves and therefore, Makipaa specifically

teaches away from the invention and the invention could not have been obvious over the combination of Tso and Makipaa. Thus, Claims 19, 23 and 24, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward Kmett/

_____
Edward A. Kmett
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 127219v1